REMARKS

Claims 1, 3 and 5-15 were pending in the present application. Claims 5, 6 and ***8***-14 have been withdrawn as being directed to non-elected inventions or species. The instant office action states that claims 5, 6 and 9-14 are withdrawn. Applicants respectfully note that claim 8 was withdrawn in response to the restriction requirement dated March 22, 2007. In Applicants' response, dated July 23, 2007, Group A was elected, wherein an autoantigen is not administered to the subject. This was noted by the Examiner in the non-final office action, dated October 19, 2007. No new matter has been added.

Amendment or cancellation of claims should not be construed as an acquiescence, narrowing, or surrender of any subject matter. The amendments are being made not only to point out with particularity and to claim the present invention, but also to expedite prosecution of the present application. Applicants reserve the right to prosecute the originally filed claims further, or similar ones, in the instant or subsequently filed patent applications.

Indication of Allowed and Objected Claims

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's indication that claim 15 is allowed. Claim 7 is objected to and Applicants further believe that claims 1 and 3 appear to be allowable, except for the outstanding rejection under obvious-type double patenting (see section 1, paragraph 8, p. 2 of instant Office Action), since the elected invention reads on "wherein an autoantigen is not administered to the subject." Further, the previous rejections in the Non-Final Office Action, dated October 19, 2007, have been withdrawn (sections 4, 5 and 6 on p. 3 of instant Office Action) by the Examiner and the "amended claims, filed January 22, 2008, has placed the elected invention…free of the prior art" (section 7, p. 3 of instant Office Action). Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner clarify the allowability of claims 1 and 3.

Rejection of Claim 8 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph

The Examiner has rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for allegedly containing subject matter which was not described in the specification. Specifically, the

Examiner contends that the "applicant was not in possession of the claimed 'autoantigens' as an element of the claimed methods…" (p. 4 of instant office action).

In response to the restriction requirement dated July 23, 2007, claim 8 was withdrawn, as stated *supra*. Applicants believe this rejection is therefore considered moot.

Nonstatutory Obviousness-Type Double Patenting Rejections

The Examiner has provisionally rejected claims 1 and 3 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2, 4, and 8-11 of U.S. Patent No. 6,719,972. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner hold in abeyance all obviousness-type double patenting rejections based on said issued U.S. patent until allowable subjected matter is indicated, at which point Applicants will consider filing a terminal disclaimer.

CONCLUSION

Early and favorable reconsideration is respectfully solicited. The Examiner may address any questions raised by this submission to the undersigned at (617) 832-1000. If any fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to credit any overpayment or charge any deficiencies to **Deposit Account No. 06-1448, Reference No. WYS-020.02.**

Respectfully submitted,
Foley Hoag LLP

Dated: August 1, 2008
Customer No: 25181
Patent Department
Foley Hoag, LLP
155 Seaport Blvd.
Boston, MA 02210-2600
Phone: (617) 832-1000
Fax: (617) 832-7000

/DeAnn F. Smith/
DeAnn F. Smith, Esq.
Reg. No. 36,683
Attorney for Applicants